



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/582,412	05/30/2008	Victoria A. Wofford	21528.0127	1096

64304 7590 12/22/2011

STRASBURGER & PRICE, LLP

ATTN: IP SECTION

1401 MCKINNEY

SUITE 2200

HOUSTON, TX 77010

EXAMINER

JOSEPH, TONYA S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3628

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/22/2011

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/582,412	WOFFORD ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	TONYA JOSEPH	3628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 September 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on \_\_\_\_; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)         | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114*

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 09/01/2011 has been entered.

### Status of Claims

Claims 1-26 have been previously examined. Claims 1-4 have been amended. Claims 59-65 have been cancelled, due to a restriction requirement. No claims have been added. Thus, claims 1-26 are presented for examination.

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments filed 09/01/2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that March does not propose receiving, matching and/or consolidating of travel electronic data in real time. The Examiner disagrees. March teaches

[0081] Specifically, the **financial transactions** of a company's employees can be **monitored for real time inventory, distribution, and cash flow control purposes (i.e. to implement spending limits etc.)** Accordingly, fund transfer system 10 provides a corporate client with the ability to remotely authorize fund transfers as well as to **integrate employee transactions (buy/sell) in real time with the corporation's general ledger with a minimum of delay (i.e. for real time accounting and operations)**. The ability to control and **track real-time spending incurred by travelling executives**, salespeople and sports teams provides organizations with the ability to conduct **immediate reconciliation** of expenses through centralized head office accounting departments.

Art Unit: 3628

As shown above and contrary to Applicant's assertions, the cited portion of March does indeed show that the real time tracking of employee travel spending, matching consolidating and reconciliation was old and well known in the art of travel expensing. Accordingly, Applicant's arguments with respect to March are not persuasive and the rejection will be maintained.

Applicant's remaining arguments are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fredericks et al. U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2004/0167808 A1 in view of Barrett U.S. Patent No. 6,029,144.

3. As per Claim 1, Fredericks teaches receiving travel and credit card electronic data from the multiple electronic data sources with a computer processor (see para. 24-25 & 44);  
matching the credit card electronic data to the travel electronic data for each of the travelers (see para. 29 and 41);  
consolidating in real time the travel electronic data and the credit card electronic data from the sources with said processor (see para. 42-44);

Art Unit: 3628

determining with said processor a variance for each of said matched credit card electronic data and travel electronic data for each of the trips for taken by each of the travelers, including a first variance for a first trip for taken by a first traveler of a first business unit having for which a first travel expense is incurred, wherein said first business unit has multiple travelers incurring multiple travel expenses (see para. 56 and 65);

identifying a portion of the consolidated electronic data that a user is entitled to receive (see para. 27 and 34); and

supplying said portion of consolidated data to said user with said processor (see para. 34); Fredericks does not explicitly teach processing employee expenses in real time.

March teaches employee transaction can be tracked in real time in order to accommodate a company's ledger. It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of Fredericks to include the teachings of March to provide real time accounting in a company's ledger. Fredericks does not explicitly teach the limitation taught by Barrett wherein said step of supplying includes supplying a first analysis of travel spending for said first trip including said first travel expense and said first variance while simultaneously supplying a second analysis of all of said travel expenses for all of said travelers of said first business unit (see Col. 6 lines 49-67 and Fig. 6). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of Fredericks and March to include the teachings of Barrett to determine compliance with a company policy. While Barrett does not explicitly recite simultaneously analyzing while finding a

Art Unit: 3628

variance, the suggestion would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention, as the system of Barrett processes and analyzing multiple expense reports from various employees. Nothing in Barrett suggests that the determining a variance-(which in itself is analyzing), while still processing other reports is outside the capabilities of the system . Further the system of March authorizes fund transfers while at the same time performing reconciliation of these transactions (see para. 81 or March).

4. As per Claim 2, Fredericks in view of March in further view of Barrett in further view of Barrett teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Fredericks further teaches initiating a travel booking process by said first traveler for said first trip between a first location and a second location and incurring said first travel expense received by said computer processor (see para. 26). Fredericks does not explicitly teach the limitation taught by March wherein said first analysis is provided in real time by said computer processor to during said travel booking process (see para. 81). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of Fredericks to include the teachings of March to provide real time accounting in a company's ledger

5. As per Claim 3, Fredericks in view of March in further view of Barrett in further view of Barrett teaches the method of claim 2 as described above. Fredericks does not explicitly teach the limitation taught by Barrett comparing said first travel expense with a first travel expense criteria with said computer processor (see Col. 6 lines 49-67 and Fig. 6); Fredericks does not explicitly teach the limitation taught by March comparing in

Art Unit: 3628

real time on a computer with said computer processor during said travel booking process immediately after said step of initiating (see para. 81). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of Fredericks to include the teachings of March to provide real time accounting in a company's ledger. Fredericks teaches displaying travel data (see para. 38 and 56).

6. As per Claim 4, Fredericks in view of March in further view of Barrett in further view of Barrett teaches the method of claim 2 as described above. Fredericks does not explicitly teach the limitation taught by Barrett comparing all of said travel expenses for all of said travelers of said first business unit with a second travel expense criteria with said computer processor (see Col. 6 lines 49-67 and Fig. 6); Fredericks does not explicitly teach the limitation taught by March comparing of all of said travel expenses for all of said travelers of said first business unit with said second travel expense criteria in real time on a computer with said computer processor during said travel booking process immediately after said step of initiating (see para. 81). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of Fredericks to include the teachings of March to provide real time accounting in a company's ledger. Fredericks teaches displaying travel data (see para. 38 and 56).

7. As per Claim 5, Fredericks in view of March in further view of Barrett teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Fredericks further teaches wherein said sources include one or more corporate card providers, travel agency service providers, and ancillary travel service providers (see para. 26).

8. As per Claim 6, Fredericks in view of March in further view of Barrett teaches the method of claim 5 as described above. The cited portion of claim 5 meets the limitation of this claim, as the limitations of claim 5 are presented in the alternative.

9. As per Claim 7, Fredericks in view of March in further view of Barrett teaches the method of claim 5 as described above. Fredericks further teaches, wherein corporate card providers include corporate card data sources (see para. 26 and 45).

10. As per Claim 8, Fredericks in view of March in further view of Barrett teaches the method of claim 5 as described above. The cited portion of claim 5 meets the limitation of this claim, as the limitations of claim 5 are presented in the alternative.

11. As per Claim 9, Fredericks in view of March in further view of Barrett teaches the method of claim 5 as described above. The cited portion of claim 5 meets the limitation of this claim, as the limitations of claim 5 are presented in the alternative.

12. As per Claim 10, Fredericks in view of March in further view of Barrett teaches the method of claim 5 as described above. Fredericks further teaches wherein said steps of consolidating and receiving are is done substantially simultaneously (see para. 68).

13. As per Claim 11, Fredericks in view of March in further view of Barrett teaches the method of claim 10 as described above. Fredericks further teaches wherein said steps of supplying occurring substantially simultaneously with said steps of consolidating and receiving (see para. 68 and 71)

14. As per Claim 12, Fredericks in view of March in further view of Barrett teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Fredericks further teaches wherein said

Art Unit: 3628

supplying is performed through a display available to at least one of the business units (see para 71).

15. As per Claim 13, Fredericks in view of March in further view of Barrett teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Fredericks further teaches wherein said step of supplying is through a display in formats that are configured to be manipulated (see para. 40).

16. As per Claim 14, Fredericks in view of March in further view of Barrett teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Fredericks further teaches wherein said step of supplying indicates the travelers who have potentially deviated from a policy of the business unit (see para. 69).

17. As per Claim 15, Fredericks in view of March in further view of Barrett teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Fredericks further teaches wherein said step of supplying of consolidated data highlights includes pricing errors (see claim 29).

18. As per Claim 16, (Fredericks in view of March in further view of Barrett teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Fredericks further teaches wherein said supplying of consolidated data indicates any traveler who has deviated from the planned itinerary of the traveler (see para. 28).

19. As per Claim 17, Fredericks in view of March in further view of Barrett teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Fredericks further teaches wherein said analysis is configured to be used in a travel budget plan (see para. 27).

20. As per Claim 18, Fredericks in view of March in further view of Barrett teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Fredericks further teaches wherein said step

Art Unit: 3628

of supplying of identifies at least one of new destinations, pre-travel approvals, policy exceptions of all travelers, real time tracking of expenditures, requirements for supplier contracts and analysis relative to the current travel, performance measurement, and individual information of a specific traveler (see para. 71).

21. As per Claim 19, Fredericks in view of March in further view of Barrett teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Fredericks further teaches wherein said supplying is performed through one or more computer networks formed by at least one business unit and at least some of each of the travelers, management and suppliers and wherein the suppliers include credit card companies (see para. 45, 53 and 71).

22. As per Claim 20, Fredericks in view of March in further view of Barrett teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Fredericks further teaches wherein said step of supplying includes the step of sorting the data (see para. 71).

23. As per Claim 21, Fredericks in view of March in further view of Barrett teaches the method of claim 20 as described above. Fredericks further teaches wherein said step of supplying includes the step of aggregating the data (see para. 71).

24. As per Claim 22, Fredericks in view of March in further view of Barrett teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Fredericks does not explicitly teach the limitation taught by Barrett wherein said step of supplying of the data includes determining rights to review the data (see Col. 6 lines 62-65). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of Fredericks and March to include the teachings of Barrett to have an auditor access claims that violate policy.

Art Unit: 3628

25. As per Claim 23, Fredericks in view of March in further view of Barrett teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Fredericks does not explicitly teach the limitation taught by Barrett wherein there is included the step of calculating metrics from said consolidated electronic the data (see Col. 34-39). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of Fredericks and March to include the teachings of Barrett to determine compliance with a company policy.

26. As per Claim 24, Fredericks in view of March in further view of Barrett teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Fredericks further teaches wherein there is further included the step of: initiating travel transactions (see para. 22).

27. As per Claim 25, Fredericks in view of March in further view of Barrett teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Fredericks further teaches wherein said step of initiating travel transactions originates from a display unit used for said step of supplying (see para. 71, the Examiner is interpreting the display unit used by the traveler as a display unit used to supply the travel data to a manager).

28. As per Claim 26, Fredericks in view of March in further view of Barrett teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Fredericks further teaches wherein the suppliers include at least one of any GDSs, travel agencies, credit card companies, and alternate travel data sources (see para. 66).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TONYA JOSEPH whose telephone number is (571)270-

Art Unit: 3628

1361. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 7:30 am-5:00pm First Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Hayes can be reached on 571 272 6708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/TONYA JOSEPH/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3628